

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
MARK SOKOLOW, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

Docket No:

04-CV-397 (GBD) (RLE)

- against -

THE PALESTINE LIBERATION ORGANIZATION,
et al.,

Defendants.
-----X

**DEFENDANTS' OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO
PLAINTIFFS' FIRST REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS TO DEFENDANTS
(TO THE GOULD AND WALDMAN PLAINTIFFS)**

Defendants The Palestinian Authority ("PA") and the Palestine Liberation Organization ("PLO") (collectively "Defendants"), by their counsel, and pursuant to Rules 26 and 36 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, hereby respectfully submit their Objections and, where applicable, Responses to "Plaintiffs' First Request for Admissions to Defendants," dated November 21, 2012 ("Request" or "Requests"), and state as follows:

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. Defendants object to the Requests to the extent that the definitions or instructions set forth therein seek to impose requirements beyond those contained in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules of this Court.
2. Defendants object to the Requests to the extent that they seek admissions concerning matters that are "in dispute." *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 36, cmts.
3. Defendants object to the Requests to the extent that they refer to documents that were not created by Defendants or cannot be authenticated by Defendants through a reasonable

Defendants incorporate herein by reference the foregoing General and Specific Objections to Request No. 93. Subject to, and without waiving those Objections, Defendants respond based on their understanding and interpretation of the terms contained in the Request as follows:

Defendants admit this Request.

REQUEST:

94. The PA can sue and/or be sued in Israeli courts,

OBJECTIONS:

Defendants incorporate herein by reference the foregoing General Objections. In addition, Defendants object to Request No. 94 on the grounds that, as potentially construed, the use of the words and phrase "Israeli courts" is vague and ambiguous.

RESPONSE:

Defendants incorporate herein by reference the foregoing General and Specific Objections to Request No. 94. Subject to, and without waiving those Objections, Defendants respond based on their understanding and interpretation of the terms contained in the Request as follows:

Defendants deny this Request.

REQUEST:

95. The PA can be sued in foreign courts.

OBJECTIONS:

Defendants incorporate herein by reference the foregoing General Objections. In addition, Defendants object to Request No. 94 on the grounds that, as potentially construed, the use of the words and phrase "foreign courts" is vague and ambiguous.

RESPONSE:

Defendants incorporate herein by reference the foregoing General and Specific Objections to Request No. 95. Subject to, and without waiving those Objections, Defendants respond based on their understanding and interpretation of the terms contained in the Request as follows:

Defendants state that, after a reasonable inquiry, the information that is known to or that can readily be obtained by Defendants is insufficient to enable Defendants to admit or deny Request No. 95, therefore, Defendants deny this Request.

REQUEST:

96. The PA does not have members.

OBJECTIONS:

Defendants incorporate herein by reference the foregoing General Objections. In addition, Defendants object to Request No. 96 on the grounds that, as potentially construed, the use of the word “members” is vague and ambiguous.

RESPONSE:

Defendants incorporate herein by reference the foregoing General and Specific Objections to Request No. 96. Subject to, and without waiving those Objections, Defendants respond based on their understanding and interpretation of the terms contained in the Request as follows:

Defendants state that, after a reasonable inquiry, the information that is known to or that can readily be obtained by Defendants is insufficient to enable Defendants to admit or deny Request No. 96, therefore, Defendants deny this Request.

REQUEST:

97. The PA does not have membership dues.

OBJECTIONS:

Defendants incorporate herein by reference the foregoing General Objections. In addition, Defendants object to Request No. 97 on the grounds that, as potentially construed, the use of the words and phrase “membership dues” is vague and ambiguous.

RESPONSE:

Defendants incorporate herein by reference the foregoing General and Specific Objections to Request No. 97. Subject to, and without waiving those Objections, Defendants respond based on their understanding and interpretation of the terms contained in the Request as follows:

Defendants admit this Request.

REQUEST:

98. The PA holds assets in its own name.

OBJECTIONS:

Defendants incorporate herein by reference the foregoing General Objections. In addition, Defendants object to Request No. 98 on the grounds that, as potentially construed, the use of the words and phrase “holds assets in its own name” is vague and ambiguous.

RESPONSE:

Defendants incorporate herein by reference the foregoing General and Specific Objections to Request No. 98. Subject to, and without waiving those Objections, Defendants respond based on their understanding and interpretation of the terms contained in the Request as follows:

Defendants admit this Request.

REQUEST:

99. The PA can enter into binding contracts inside the Palestinian territory.

OBJECTIONS:

Defendants incorporate herein by reference the foregoing General Objections. In addition, Defendants object to Request No. 99 on the grounds that, as potentially construed, the use of the words and phrases “binding contracts” and “inside the Palestinian territory” is vague and ambiguous.

RESPONSE:

Defendants incorporate herein by reference the foregoing General and Specific Objections to Request No. 99. Subject to, and without waiving those Objections, Defendants respond based on their understanding and interpretation of the terms contained in the Request as follows:

Defendants admit this Request.

REQUEST:

100. The PA can enter into binding contracts outside the Palestinian territory.

OBJECTIONS:

Defendants incorporate herein by reference the foregoing General Objections. In addition, Defendants object to Request No. 100 on the grounds that, as potentially construed, the use of the words and phrases “binding contracts” and “outside the Palestinian territory” is vague and ambiguous.

RESPONSE:

Defendants incorporate herein by reference the foregoing General and Specific Objections to Request No. 100. Subject to, and without waiving those Objections, Defendants

respond based on their understanding and interpretation of the terms contained in the Request as follows:

Defendants state that, after a reasonable inquiry, the information that is known to or that can readily be obtained by Defendants is insufficient to enable Defendants to admit or deny Request No. 100, therefore, Defendants deny this Request.

REQUEST:

101. Ali Yusuf “Ja’ara” was the suicide bomber in the Goldberg bombing on January 29, 2004.

OBJECTIONS:

Defendants incorporate herein by reference the foregoing General Objections. In addition, Defendants object to Request No. 101 on the grounds that, as potentially construed, the use of the words and phrases “Ali Yusuf Ja’ara,” “suicide bomber,” and “Goldberg bombing” is vague and ambiguous.

RESPONSE:

Defendants incorporate herein by reference the foregoing General and Specific Objections to Request No. 101. Subject to, and without waiving those Objections, Defendants respond based on their understanding and interpretation of the terms contained in the Request as follows:

Defendants state that, after a reasonable inquiry, the information that is known to or that can readily be obtained by Defendants is insufficient to enable Defendants to admit or deny Request No. 101, therefore, Defendants deny this Request.

REQUEST:

102. Ja’ara was a PA employee, agent or assign at the time of the Goldberg bombing on January 29, 2004.